

## 1 ABSTRACT

2 Mass regulation in small birds is based on simultaneously minimising starvation and predation risk,  
3 but the mechanisms birds use to assess starvation risk are still debated. Whilst we know that birds  
4 anticipate periods of unpredictable food availability/energy expenditure (e.g. the winter and night)  
5 by increasing their fat reserves, we do not know whether this anticipation involves learning. This  
6 study investigated whether birds could learn to use a light cue that predicted a period of food  
7 unavailability, to adaptively regulate their foraging and/or body weight. Sixteen captive starlings  
8 (*Sturnus vulgaris*) were subjected to 42 days of an irregular schedule of food deprivation that  
9 involved depriving them of food for 5 hours on 20 pseudo-randomly chosen days. Birds were  
10 randomly allocated to two treatment groups for which a 30-minute period of reduced ambient light  
11 either provided perfect information (Predictable) or no information (Unpredictable) about upcoming  
12 food deprivation. Both groups of birds increased their dawn body mass over the period of the  
13 experiment, consistent with a response to unpredictable food deprivation. However, no differences  
14 in either foraging behaviour or dawn body mass emerged between the groups, suggesting that the  
15 Predictable birds were unable to learn to use the light cue to initiate anticipatory foraging ahead of  
16 food deprivation. Furthermore, both groups immediately decreased their foraging behaviour in  
17 response to the onset of the light cue, suggesting that starlings do not have an evolved anticipatory  
18 foraging response to low light levels. Further work is needed to test alternative cues and designs  
19 before any general conclusions can be drawn regarding the flexibility of anticipatory foraging.

## 20 KEYWORDS

21 anticipatory foraging, associative learning, body mass, fat regulation, food intake, unpredictable  
22 fasting, winter storm

23

## 24 INTRODUCTION

25 For many animals, carrying body fat has costs and benefits: too little fat and they starve (Ketterson  
26 & King, 1977; Stuebe & Ketterson, 1982); too much fat and they increase their likelihood of  
27 predation (Blem, 1975; Brodin, 2001; Witter & Cuthill, 1993). Theoretical models show there is an  
28 optimum level of body fat that minimises the combined risk of starvation and predation, and that  
29 this optimum will vary depending on environmental conditions (Lima, 1986; McNamara & Houston,  
30 1990). A key prediction from these theoretical models is that if perceived starvation risk is lower,  
31 body masses will decline to reduce predation risk. Conversely, if perceived starvation risk is higher,  
32 body masses will increase to reduce starvation risk. Corroboration of these predictions comes from  
33 multiple field and laboratory studies on passerine birds (Cuthill et al., 2000; Hudin et al., 2016;  
34 Witter et al., 1995).

35 There is empirical evidence that passerine birds not only adjust body masses in response to current  
36 starvation risk, but that they also strategically regulate their body fat in anticipation of future  
37 starvation risk. Well-studied examples of anticipatory regulation include fat gain prior to winter and  
38 nightfall. In winter, food availability and energy expenditure are less predictable than in other  
39 seasons, and small birds increase foraging intensity and body fat levels in autumn (King & Mewaldt,  
40 1981; McEwan & Whitehead, 1984; Pienkowski et al., 1979) to buffer against upcoming periods of  
41 forced fasting and/or increased energy expenditure (Blem, 1976). Similarly, overnight starvation  
42 presents a significant survival risk for many small birds and they increase foraging intensity and body  
43 fat levels immediately before dusk to mitigate this risk (Houston et al., 1993; Polo & Bautista, 2006;  
44 Witter & Cuthill, 1993). Despite their rapidity, short-term changes in fat within a day can be large  
45 and comparable to fat changes in winter (Meijer et al., 1994). For example, in European starlings  
46 (*Sturnus vulgaris*) the amount of weight gained prior to dusk may represent 6-14% of their total  
47 dawn body mass, which is similar to the amount of weight gained prior to winter corresponding to  
48 11% of autumn body mass (Cuthill et al., 2000; Meijer et al., 1994).

While we know that anticipatory regulation of body fat occurs, the mechanisms that govern it are poorly understood (Kelly et al., 2002). We do not know whether anticipatory regulation is an inflexible evolved response to reliable natural cues, or whether birds can respond to novel cues by associative learning. There is evidence that the amount of body fat deposited in anticipation of winter reflects long-term average energy demands from past winters (Biebach, 1996; Evans, 1969). Yet even with the added buffer provided by winter fattening, the actual fat reserves for many small birds only allows for a very small period of disruption to foraging by unusually severe winter storms (Carey & Dawson, 1999). For example, in starlings, the amount of additional fat carried during winter can only buffer against a single 24-hour period without food (Meijer et al., 1994). Consequently, it has been suggested that any mechanism involved in anticipatory winter fattening ought to be flexible, so that fat levels can be adjusted in response to short-term fluctuations in energy requirements or food availability (Blem & Shelor, 1986). Such a mechanism could use reliable cues of upcoming food unavailability (Lima, 1986), such as weather changes that signal approaching storms. Rapid, anticipatory adjustments of foraging behaviour and body fat could then occur, much in the same manner as the daily patterns of fat changes.

We have good reason to suspect that birds may be able to make flexible short-term, anticipatory adjustments in this way. In an opportunistic study, Middleton (1982) observed American goldfinches (*Spinus tristis*) flocking to bird feeders in the hour preceding a harsh snow storm. Inclement weather can severely reduce feeding opportunities (Graber & Graber, 1979) and may cause significant mortality to bird populations (Carey & Dawson, 1999). Middleton (1982) showed that the foraging effort of the goldfinches was much greater in the hour before the storm compared to similar time-periods on non-stormy days and that the masses of birds captured during the storm were greater than in the days preceding it. He speculated that an increased mass and a full gut would help protect the birds from starvation and the low overnight temperature. Later work has provided some experimental support for the idea that birds undergo short-term increases in body fat in response to cues of upcoming storms, such as increased rainfall (Kelly et al., 2002), reduced ambient

temperature (Krams et al., 2010) and reduced barometric pressure (Breuner et al., 2013; Metcalfe et al., 2013). However, with the exception of barometric pressure, it could be that the increases in body fat observed were responses to the increased energy demands provided by the meteorological changes themselves as opposed to adjustments in anticipation of increased starvation risk. Furthermore, these studies shed no light on whether birds have acquired knowledge of cues of storms by natural selection or by individual learning.

The aims of the current study were to test experimentally the hypothesis that birds can learn to use an environmental cue to anticipate and prepare for upcoming food deprivation. We used a laboratory experiment in order to eliminate confounds often present in natural environments. We studied European starlings, since there is strong evidence for body mass regulation in response to laboratory manipulations of food availability and energy expenditure in this species (Bednekoff & Krebs, 1995; Cuthill et al., 2000; Witter et al., 1995). Starlings were exposed to an environment in which food was occasionally (approximately every two days on average) unavailable for a period of 5 hours. The birds were randomly allocated to two treatment groups. In the Predictable group an environmental cue perfectly predicted the periods of food unavailability and in the Unpredictable group the same cue was completely uninformative. By only manipulating the informativeness of the cue (via its correlation with subsequent food deprivation), we were able to keep constant the frequency, duration and sequence of food deprivation to ensure that the level of environmental harshness did not differ between treatment groups (c.f. Cuthill et al., 2000). The cue that we used was an instant drop in the ambient light intensity that lasted 30-minutes in duration. This cue was chosen to be an ecologically plausible predictor of storms, since it is possible that birds might be more prepared to learn ecologically relevant cues (Seligman, 1970). Furthermore, the cue was chosen so as not to change the energy expenditure of the birds themselves, in order to allow us to study true anticipatory fattening as opposed to a direct response to increased energy expenditure. Since the birds that we used were hand-reared in the laboratory (Nettle et al., 2017) and had never been housed outside, they had no exposure to storms, and hence no opportunity prior to the

current experiment to learn an association between a sudden drop in ambient light and food unavailability.

If the birds learnt to respond adaptively to the light cue during our experiment, we predicted the following: 1) increased foraging activity following the onset of the cue for the Predictable group only; 2) increased food consumption following the onset of the cue for the Predictable group only; 3) *lower* dawn body masses for the Predictable group relative to the Unpredictable group, reflecting the fact that only the Predictable group could restrict their adaptive weight gain to the period immediately prior to the period of food unavailability. In addition, we predicted an emergence of differences between groups over time, reflecting the time needed to learn the association between cue and food unavailability. Alternatively, if starlings have an unlearnt response to a reduction in ambient light that has evolved because low light often precedes periods of food unavailability in natural environments, we predicted the following: 1) increased foraging activity following the onset of the cue for both groups; 2) increased food consumption following the onset of the cue for both groups; 3) no difference in dawn body masses between groups. In addition, we predicted an immediate difference in foraging behaviour and food consumption for both groups following the onset of the cue, reflecting the fact that the response to the cue was not learnt. Finally, independent of whether the birds showed any learnt or unlearnt response to the cue, we predicted that all birds should show a gradual increase in dawn body mass reflecting the initial unpredictable food deprivation present in both groups.

## METHODS

### *Husbandry and Housing*

### *Ethics statement*

The current study was approved by the ethical review committee at Newcastle University and complied with the Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour's guidelines for use of animals in research. The study was carried out under UK home office Project Licence number PPL70/8089. The removal of starlings from the wild prior to this study was approved by Natural England, under licence number 20121066.

#### *Subject historical information*

Experimental animals were 16 starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*), 8 males and 8 females, that comprised four families of four siblings. At the time of the current experiment, the birds were three years of age. The birds were taken from nests on day five post-hatching and hand reared to adulthood as part of a previous study that involved manipulating the amount of food they were given and the effort required to receive it during the nestling period (Nettle et al., 2017). This manipulation was not part of the current investigation and was counterbalanced along with sex between treatment groups of the current experiment.

#### *Room setup*

Prior to the current experiment, birds were group-housed in indoor aviaries supplied with ad lib food and water. Birds were caught from the aviary and transferred to individual cages in a separate room for the duration of the experiment. A single room was used to standardise any room-effects between treatment groups. The temperature in the room was ~20 °C and the humidity was ~41%. Due to the size restriction of the experimental room, the 16 birds were divided into two consecutive replicates of eight, each consisting of four birds per treatment group. The experimental room contained eight 75 x 45 x 45cm cages that were placed against the walls in stacks of two. The position of the birds in the room was counterbalanced between treatment groups. Every bird was provided with a water bath, two drinkers, two perches, and one food bowl. Food (Special Diets Services 'Poultry Starter (HPS)' domestic chick crumb) were available ad lib except during deprivation periods.

149

150 *Light regime*

151 The lighting in the room was remotely controlled and consisted of four vertical halogen corner lights  
152 and four evenly spaced halogen ceiling lights. During the experiment, the light-dark schedule was set  
153 at 15L:9D. This was identical to the schedule that the birds have been maintained on since fledging,  
154 although here dawn and dusk were delayed by four hours for experimenter convenience. In order to  
155 simulate a dawn, the lights came on at 0950 every morning and increased in intensity every minute  
156 until they reached their maximum at 1000 (Figure 1). In the evening, the lights started dimming to  
157 simulate dusk at 0050 and incrementally decreased in intensity until they turned off at 0100.

158 *Experimental Design*

159 *Habituation phase*

160 The experiment started with a cage habituation phase of six days. By the start of the experimental  
161 phase all birds were eating a minimum of 8 g of domestic chick crumb (hereafter referred to as  
162 'food') per day.

163 *Experimental phase*

164 The experimental phase lasted for 42 days during which the birds were subjected to 20 periods of  
165 food deprivation. All food deprivation periods lasted for five hours and, if they occurred, always took  
166 place between 1100-1600. Days where food deprivation took place were pseudo-randomly  
167 allocated in a way that ensured all birds were deprived for a total of 20 days, and the distribution of  
168 occurrence of one, two and three days of consecutive deprivation was identical for both treatment  
169 groups (Table 1). The difference between treatment groups came from the informativeness of a light  
170 cue preceding the deprivation period. The light cue, when it occurred, was an immediate reduction  
171 in light intensity from 100% (340 lx) to 30% for all lights that started at 1030 and ended at 1100  
172 when light intensity was returned to 100% (Figure 1). The Predictable treatment group always

received this light cue prior to food deprivation. The Unpredictable treatment group received the light cue on 10 of the deprivation days (50%) and on 10 non-deprivation days (Table 1). Consequently, the light cue was completely informative for the Predictable group, but completely uninformative for the Unpredictable group, which was thus a “truly random” control group (Rescorla, 1967, 1988). This design ensured that both treatment groups received near-identical experience of food deprivation, but differed in the informativeness of the cue.

#### *Daily experimental procedure*

Ten minutes before dawn (0950), any remaining food was removed from the cages and exchanged with a fresh bowl of food (Figure 1). Five minutes before dawn, two cameras were placed on tripods and were positioned facing the cages at a distance of 1m. Before leaving the room, a curtain was drawn between the cages to reduce social facilitation of foraging behaviour. From dawn to 1030, the birds were free to eat ad lib food. On cue days (see Table 1) the light cue started at 1030 and lasted for 30 minutes. At 1100, food was either removed (on deprivation days: Table 1) or otherwise exchanged for a new bowl. Cameras were also removed at this point. At 1600, a new bowl of food was given, regardless of the day. Daily husbandry also took place at this time. From 1600 onwards, the birds were left undisturbed for the remainder of the day and night.

#### *Outcome Variables*

Three outcome variables were measured: foraging time and food intake to assess the presence of any adaptive increase in foraging behaviour; and body mass to assess the impact of any change in foraging behaviour on body mass regulation.

#### *Foraging time*

The amount of time that starlings foraged was recorded via video camera during the 30 minutes between the time when a light cue could start (1030) and the time when food deprivation could begin (1100). We also recorded this behaviour in the 40 minutes between dawn (0950) and when



the light cue could start (1030) to provide a baseline level of foraging effort for each bird on each day; this measure was used as a control variable in our analyses. Filming took place every day to facilitate habituation and to avoid associations with the presence of the cameras. A representative subset of video footage was analysed for foraging behaviour (Table 1). Video footage from five evenly distributed cue days and four evenly distributed non-cue days was analysed (Table 1; cue days: 17, 26, 32, 36 and 42; non-cue days: 16, 22, 28 (Predictable birds only), 31 (Unpredictable birds only) and 34). These days were chosen as there was no deprivation on the preceding days, which reduced the likelihood of any behavioural effects of the deprivation from carrying over into the foraging behaviour recorded on video. Thus, across the entire experiment we analysed nine days' worth of video footage for each bird. A bird was designated as foraging when the tip of its beak was below the rim of the food bowl.

#### *Food intake*

Food intake was measured every day during the period from dawn (0950) until the onset of possible food deprivation (1100). Food intake was not measured during the period of the cue only (1030-1100), as this would have required the food bowl to be exchanged at the time of the light cue, introducing an additional cue. Consequently, food intake was a less precise measure of adaptive foraging behaviour than time spent foraging because it additionally includes foraging that occurred before the onset of the cue. We also measured food intake between 1600-0100 to provide a baseline level of food consumption for each bird on each day; this measure was used as a control variable in our analyses.

#### *Dawn body mass*

For the purpose of this experiment, dawn body mass was measured as a proxy for fat reserves. To obtain a precise measure of body mass maintained outside of the food deprivation periods, the birds were weighed before dawn when the gut was empty. Weighing took place 10-30 minutes before dawn at the start of each phase and on every third day of the experimental phase. Birds were caught

by hand in the dark, placed in a weighing cone and weighed in grams on a digital scale to two decimal places. The first nine days of experimental data were excluded from the subsequent analysis owing to a change in experimental protocol between replicates (pre-dawn weighing did not start until day nine for the first replicate but was undertaken for the entirety of the second replicate). Thus, across the entire experiment each bird underwent 12 separate mass measurements. Our analyses of body mass involved three control variables that are likely to have contributed to between- and within-individual variation in mass: tarsus length to control for individual differences in skeletal size; sex, because male starlings are heavier than females; and the number of days since the last period of food deprivation. Tarsus length was measured when skeletal growth was complete (day 56 post-hatching) with digital callipers; in the current study we used the mean of two replicate measurements of each leg.

### *Statistical Analysis*

All data analyses were undertaken in R version 3.3.2 (R Core Team, 2016). The raw data files and the R script are available at the Zenodo repository (van Berkel et al., 2018). We fitted linear mixed models using the package lme4 (Bates et al., 2015). Error distribution was Gaussian and all models used in the analysis were checked to satisfy the assumptions of normally distributed residuals and homogenous variance of residuals across the fitted values of the model. Maximum-likelihood estimation was employed throughout.

We fitted three different linear mixed models, one for each outcome variable. The fixed effects included in each model are given in Table 2. Experimental variables included: the continuous fixed effect of “Day” and the categorical fixed effects of “Treatment” (Predictable or Unpredictable) and “Cue” (Present or Not present). We included all 2-way and, where relevant, 3-way interactions between experimental variables. Control variables included were: the continuous effect of “Baseline foraging” (time spent foraging between 0950 and 1030; model 1); the continuous effect of “Baseline consumption” (how much a bird had eaten on the previous day between 1600 and 0100; model 2);

the continuous effect of “Tarsus” length, the categorical effect of “Sex” (male or female) and the continuous effect of “Days since last deprivation” (model 3). Two random effects, the individual bird ID and its natal nest were included in all three models.

Significance testing was carried out by the likelihood ratio test (LRT), which compares the change in deviance when a term is excluded from the model with the  $\chi^2$  distribution with 1 degree of freedom. We assumed a criterion for significance of  $P < 0.05$  with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) also shown.

## RESULTS

The output of the final models detailing the significance of all fixed effects and interactions are given in Table 2. Findings of relevance to our hypotheses are described below. Note that we also repeated our three models on a subset of data from day 36 onwards and excluded the fixed effect of “Day”. This was to reveal any differences in our outcome variables at the end of the experiment without the need to consider interactions with the “Day” variable. As these results were in-line with our existing model results, they are not reported here.

### *Foraging time*

Figure 2 shows the time spent foraging between 1030 and 1100 (i.e. the period when a cue could occur) over the course of the experiment. If the birds learnt the association between the cue and food deprivation and used this information to adjust their foraging behaviour between 1030 and 1100 in anticipation of deprivation, then foraging time during this period should have increased over time for the Predictable group only, on cues days only. However, contrary to the learning hypothesis, the critical 3-way interaction between day, treatment and cue was not significant (Table 2). Although Figure 2 suggests that the Predictable group increased their post-cue foraging behaviour over time, this non-significant increase was present on both cue and non-cue days and the interaction between day and treatment was also not significant (Table 2). Alternatively, if the

birds had an unlearnt activating response to low ambient light levels, then post-cue foraging time should have been higher from the start of the experiment in both the Predictable and Unpredictable groups. Although there was a significant main effect of cue, contrary to predictions, birds foraged significantly less on days when the cue was present compared to days when it was not present (Figure 2; Table 2).

### *Food Intake*

Figure 3 shows food intake between 0950 and 1100 (i.e. the period in the morning prior to when food deprivation could occur) over the course of the experiment. If the birds learnt the association between the cue and food deprivation and used this information to adjust their food consumption in anticipation of deprivation, then morning food intake should have increased over time for the Predictable group only, on cues days only. However, the critical interaction between day, treatment and cue was not significant (Table 2). Alternatively, if the birds had an unlearnt activating response to low ambient light levels, both groups should have immediately increased their food intake in response to the cue. Although there was a significant main effect of cue (Table 2), the starlings ate less food on cue days than they did on days when the cue was not present (Table 2).

### *Dawn Body Mass*

Figure 4 shows dawn body condition over the course of the experiment. Birds should respond to unpredictable food deprivation by gaining weight. In line with this prediction, the main effect of experimental day was significant (Table 2) and both groups gained body mass over the course of the experiment. If the birds learnt to use the cue to adjust foraging efforts in anticipation of deprivation, dawn body mass should increase less in the Predictable group, as these birds should have less need to insure against unpredictable food deprivation. However, the critical interaction

between treatment and day was not significant (Table 2) and both groups showed similar mass change trajectories (Figure 4).

## DISCUSSION

We examined whether European starlings were able to use a light cue to anticipate and prepare for upcoming food deprivation via short-term adjustments to their foraging behaviour and body masses. Our design employed a light cue that either perfectly predicted subsequent food deprivation (Predictable) or provided no information about food deprivation (Unpredictable). Both experimental groups gradually increased their dawn body masses over the course of the experiment in line with a strategic adjustment to the periods of food unavailability experienced by both groups. However, there was no difference in the rate of weight gain between groups, as would have been predicted if the Predictable group learnt anticipatory foraging in response to the cue and hence had less need to insure themselves against starvation at other times. Furthermore, time spent foraging and food intake immediately prior to deprivation actually decreased for both experimental groups on cue days relative to non-cue days. Thus, our results are consistent with the idea that starlings were unable to learn to use the light cue and also, did not have an evolved activating response to low light levels that allowed them to prepare for upcoming periods of food deprivation.

We found that food intake and time spent foraging decreased for both experimental groups following exposure to the light cue. This difference was present from the beginning and did not change as the experiment progressed. Our interpretation of this result is that it is likely that there was something intrinsic to the light cue that caused this difference, independent of the information the cue provided. However, it is not clear whether it was the sudden drop in light levels or the low intensity of ambient light itself that decreased foraging efforts for our starlings. Our findings are opposite to a previous experiment that showed that wild-caught house finches (*Haemorrhous mexicanus*) increased their foraging behaviour in response to lower luminance (Fernández-Juricic &

Tran, 2007). Possible explanations for this discrepancy are that in the house finch experiment, high and low light conditions were different compared to our experiment (we used artificial lighting at illuminance levels of 340 lx and 102 lx to simulate sunlight and shade from storm clouds respectively, whereas in the house finch experiment they used natural sunlight and shade, and so not only could absolute levels of illuminance be higher, but also the relative difference between the two conditions). Other explanations include the fact that starling vision may be restricted to a narrower luminance range than for house finches (Martin, 1986), and that wild starlings inhabit more open habitats than house finches and may have evolved to associate light levels, predation risk and thus willingness to forage in a different way (Devereux et al., 2006). Furthermore, the starlings used in our study have lived their whole lives in indoor aviaries with stable, uniform light levels and so the light cue was something highly unusual for them, which could explain the resultant decline in foraging effort.

We also found no difference in dawn body mass between treatment groups over time, which is unsurprising given that there was no evidence of anticipatory foraging behaviour in the Predictable group. Both groups increased dawn body masses over time, which is potentially due to both groups being subjected to an environment with unpredictable food availability. We are unable to definitively say that the increase in body mass was due to a variable food supply as no control group (with no food deprivation) was present; however, in another experiment of similar duration where the food supply was kept constant (*unpublished data*), we found that the rate of weight gain in long-term individually caged starlings was only 66% of that reported here. Thus, our results align with previous studies on starlings (Cuthill et al., 2000; Witter et al., 1995) and great tits (*Parus major*) (Bednekoff & Krebs, 1995), that showed increased weight in response to an unpredictable food environment.

In addition to the findings we report here, we observed rapid feeding behaviour prior to the removal of the food bowl, which seemed to occur more frequently as the experiment progressed. This

behaviour may have been anticipatory as the starlings could have made the association between the presence of an experimenter and food deprivation. If so, one possibility is that starlings were able to anticipate and act to mitigate against upcoming food deprivation, but that they did not learn the intended association with the cue in this experiment. Why this should be so is not clear, as our experiment was designed to offer the optimum conditions for associative learning to take place. We used a combination of delay (light level) and trace conditioning (light reduction). We also prevented other stimuli from blocking or overshadowing the light cue by ensuring it was the only salient stimulus that occurred prior to food deprivation. Our choice of cue was also designed to be ecologically relevant (Garcia & Koelling, 1966), as even though our captive birds had never experienced a sudden reduction in ambient light prior to food deprivation, they had experienced a gradual reduction in light prior to night where food is effectively unavailable to this diurnal species. Similarly, the mean ratio of the signal length to the inter-stimulus interval was 1:88 for our Predictable treatment group, close to the 1:90 ratio that has been used to promote rapid acquisition of conditioned responses with rats (Gallistel, Fairhurst, & Balsam, 2004). Finally, it is unlikely that time of day was used by the birds to adjust their morning feeding behaviour instead of the intended light cue, as we would have expected to see both treatment groups gradually increase their foraging effort over the course of the experiment, regardless of cue presence.

Although the current study yielded a negative result, it is possible that a different design would have produced evidence for flexible, short-term, strategic weight adjustment of the type we were hoping to see. For example, maybe we did not train the birds for long enough in the current experiment for them to acquire the desired association, or maybe the light cue was insufficiently salient to the birds (although it did impact their foraging behaviour). Maybe making excess fat more costly (perhaps by increasing cues of predation) would increase the benefits of anticipatory foraging in the Predictable group. Or maybe birds are constrained to learn about some cue other than light (e.g. atmospheric pressure) that predicts periods of food unavailability (Breuner et al., 2013). Further procedural limitations include the fact that although the onset of the cue preceded the consequence, it did not

overlap as is usually the case with delay conditioning, which could have negatively affected learning. A possible improvement on our design would be to pair other signals with our light cue to potentiate the informativeness or non-informativeness of our light cue in a discrimination procedure. The question of whether birds can learn cues of future food deprivation therefore needs further investigation before definitive conclusions can be drawn. However, if the current result holds up, it appears that although starlings respond to experienced periods of food deprivation by gaining weight, they may not be able to make rapid anticipatory adjustments in response to learned cues of future food deprivation. The rapid adjustments of foraging behaviour and body fat before a snowstorm observed by Middleton could be explained as a direct response to increased energy expenditure (caused by falling temperatures or increased wind) as opposed to the information provided by putative cues of the upcoming storm. More generally, the mechanism behind strategic fat regulation may be relatively inflexible. This could have important implications for how successful birds will be in the face of rapid environmental change, such as the introduction of artificial street lighting (Navara & Nelson, 2007) and the increased frequency of severe storms predicted to occur due to climate change (Beniston et al., 2007).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Domhnall Jennings, Alex Kacelnik and Dominic Dwyer for useful discussion regarding the design of the current experiment and Michelle Waddle and other members of the technical staff in the Comparative Biology Centre for looking after the birds.

#### FUNDING STATEMENT

This project has received funding from the BBSRC (grant numbers BB/J016446/1 and BB/J015091/1) and from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No AdG 666669, COMSTAR).

#### DATA ACCESSIBILITY



395 The raw data and R script from this experiment are publicly available at:

396 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1193788> (van Berkel et al., 2018).

#### 397 COMPETING INTERESTS

398 We have no competing interests to declare.

#### 399 AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

400 MVB wrote the first draft of the manuscript; MVB and JD carried out the experiment; MVB, MB and  
401 DN conceived the experiment. All authors contributed to the final draft.

#### 402 REFERENCES

403 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
404 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48. <http://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>

405 Bednekoff, P. A., & Krebs, J. R. (1995). Great Tit Fat Reserves: Effects of Changing and Unpredictable  
406 Feeding Day Length. *Functional Ecology*, 9(3), 457. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2390009>

407 Beniston, M., Stephenson, D. B., Christensen, O. B., Ferro, C. A. T., Frei, C., Goyette, S., ... Woth, K.  
408 (2007). Future extreme events in European climate: An exploration of regional climate model  
409 projections. *Climatic Change*, 81(SUPPL. 1), 71–95. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-006-9226-z>

410 Biebach, H. (1996). Energetics of Winter and Migratory Fattening. In C. Carey (Ed.), *Avian Energetics*  
411 *and Nutritional Ecology* (pp. 280–323). Boston, MA: Springer US. [http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0425-8_9)  
412 [4613-0425-8\\_9](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0425-8_9)

413 Blem, C. R. (1975). Geographic Variation in Wing-Loading of the House Sparrow. *The Wilson Bulletin*,  
414 87(4), 543–549. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4160690>

415 Blem, C. R. (1976). Patterns of lipid storage and utilization in birds. *American Zoologist*, 16(4), 671–  
416 684. <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/16.4.671>

417 Blem, C. R., & Shelor, M. H. (1986). Multiple regression analyses of midwinter fattening of the white-  
 418 throated sparrow. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 64, 2405–2411. <http://doi.org/10.1139/z86->  
 419 359

420 Breuner, C., Sprague, R., Patterson, S., & Woods, H. (2013). Environment, behavior and physiology:  
 421 do birds use barometric pressure to predict storms? *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 216(11),  
 422 1982–1990. <http://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.081067>

423 Brodin, A. (2001). Mass-dependent predation and metabolic expenditure in wintering birds: is there  
 424 a trade-off between different forms of predation? *Animal Behaviour*, 62(5), 993–999.  
 425 <http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2001.1844>

426 Carey, C., & Dawson, W. (1999). A search for environmental cues used by birds in survival of cold  
 427 winters. In V. Nolan, E. Ketterson, & C. Thompson (Eds.), *Current Ornithology* (pp. 1–31). New  
 428 York, USA: Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers.

429 Cuthill, I. C., Maddocks, S. A., Weall, C. V., & Jones, E. K. M. (2000). Body mass regulation in response  
 430 to changes in feeding predictability and overnight energy expenditure. *Behavioral Ecology*,  
 431 11(2), 189–195. <http://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/11.2.189>

432 Devereux, C. L., Whittingham, M. J., Fernández-Juricic, E., Vickery, J. A., & Krebs, J. R. (2006).  
 433 Predator detection and avoidance by starlings under differing scenarios of predation risk.  
 434 *Behavioral Ecology*, 17(2), 303–309. <http://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arj032>

435 Evans, P. (1969). Winter Fat Deposition and Overnight Survival of Yellow Buntings (*Emberiza*  
 436 *citrinella* L.). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 38(2), 415–423. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2781>

437 Fernández-Juricic, E., & Tran, E. (2007). Changes in vigilance and foraging behaviour with light  
 438 intensity and their effects on food intake and predator detection in house finches. *Animal*  
 439 *Behaviour*, 74(5), 1381–1390. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.01.005>

440 Gallistel, C. R., Fairhurst, S., & Balsam, P. (2004). The learning curve: Implications of a quantitative

441 analysis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(36), 13124–13131.  
 442 <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0404965101>

443 Garcia, J., & Koelling, R. A. (1966). Relation of cue to consequence in avoidance learning.  
 444 *Psychonomic Science*, 4(1), 123–124. <http://doi.org/10.3758/BF03342209>

445 Graber, J. W., & Graber, R. R. (1979). Severe Winter Weather and Bird Populations in Southern  
 446 Illinois. *The Wilson Bulletin*, 91(1), 88–103. Retrieved from  
 447 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4161170>

448 Houston, A. I., McNamara, J. M., & Hutchinson, J. M. C. (1993). General results concerning the trade-  
 449 off between gaining energy and avoiding predation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*  
 450 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 341(1298), 375–397. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1993.0123>

451 Hudin, N. S., Strubbe, D., Teyssier, A., De Neve, L., White, J., Janssens, G. P. J., & Lens, L. (2016).  
 452 Predictable food supplies induce plastic shifts in avian scaled body mass. *Behavioral Ecology*,  
 453 27(6), 1833–1840. <http://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arw108>

454 Kelly, J. P., Warnock, N., Page, G. W., & Weathers, W. W. (2002). Effects of weather on daily body  
 455 mass regulation in wintering dunlin. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 205(1), 109–120.  
 456 <http://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/13.6.766>

457 Ketterson, E. D., & King, J. R. (1977). Metabolic and Behavioral Responses to Fasting in the White-  
 458 crowned Sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys gambelii*). *Physiological Zoology*, 50(2), 115–129.  
 459 <http://doi.org/10.1086/physzool.50.2.30152551>

460 King, J. R., & Mewaldt, L. R. (1981). Variation of Body Weight in Gambel's White-Crowned Sparrows  
 461 in Winter and Spring: Latitudinal and Photoperiodic Correlates. *The Auk*, 98(4), 752–764.  
 462 Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4085896>

463 Krams, I., Cirule, D., Suraka, V., Krama, T., Rantala, M. J., & Ramey, G. (2010). Fattening strategies of  
 464 wintering great tits support the optimal body mass hypothesis under conditions of extremely

low ambient temperature. *Functional Ecology*, 24(1), 172–177. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2009.01628.x>

Lima, S. L. (1986). Predation Risk and Unpredictable Feeding Conditions: Determinants of Body Mass in Birds. *Ecology*, 67(2), 377–385. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1938580>

Martin, G. R. (1986). The eye of a passeriform bird, the European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*): eye movement amplitude, visual fields and schematic optics. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 159(4), 545–557. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00604174>

McEwan, E. H., & Whitehead, P. M. (1984). Seasonal changes in body weight and composition of dunlin (*Calidris alpina*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 62(2), 154–156. <http://doi.org/10.1139/z84-024>

McNamara, J. M., & Houston, A. I. (1990). The value of fat reserves and the tradeoff between starvation and predation. *Acta Biotheoretica*, 38(1), 37–61. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00047272>

Meijer, T., Möhring, F. J., & Trillmich, F. (1994). Annual and Daily Variation in Body Mass and Fat of Starlings *Sturnus vulgaris*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 25(2), 98–104.

Metcalf, J., Schmidt, K. L., Bezner, W., Guglielmo, C. G., & MacDougall-Shackleton, S. A. (2013). White-throated sparrows adjust behaviour in response to manipulations of barometric pressure and temperature. *Animal Behaviour*, 86(6), 1285–1290. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.09.033>

Middleton, A. (1982). Response by American Goldfinches, *Carduelis tristis*, to a Severe Winter Storm. *Canadian Field-Naturalist*, 96(2), 202–204.

Navara, K. J., & Nelson, R. J. (2007). The dark side of light at night: physiological, epidemiological, and ecological consequences. *Journal of Pineal Research*, 43(3), 215–224. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-079X.2007.00473.x>

489 Nettle, D., Andrews, C., Reichert, S., Bed, T., Kolenda, C., Parker, C., ... Bateson, M. (2017). Early-life  
 490 adversity accelerates cellular ageing and affects adult inflammation : Experimental evidence  
 491 from the European starling, (August 2016), 1–10. <http://doi.org/10.1038/srep40794>

492 Pienkowski, M. W., Lloyd, C. S., & Minton, C. D. T. (1979). Seasonal and migrational weight changes  
 493 in dunlins. *Bird Study*, 26(3), 134–148. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00063657909476632>

494 Polo, V., & Bautista, L. M. (2006). Daily routines of body mass gain in birds: 1. An exponential model.  
 495 *Animal Behaviour*, 72(3), 503–516. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.09.024>

496 R Core Team. (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. *R Foundation for*  
 497 *Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from <https://www.r-project.org/>

498 Rescorla, R. A. (1967). Pavlovian conditioning and its proper control procedures. *Psychological*  
 499 *Review*, 74(1), 71–80. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0024109>

500 Rescorla, R. A. (1988). Pavlovian conditioning: It's not what you think it is. *American Psychologist*,  
 501 43(3), 151–160. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.43.3.151>

502 Seligman, M. E. (1970). On the generality of the laws of learning. *Psychological Review*, 77(5), 406–  
 503 418. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0029790>

504 Stuebe, M. M., & Ketterson, E. D. (1982). A Study of Fasting in Tree Sparrows (*Spizella arborea*) and  
 505 Dark-Eyed Juncos (*Junco hyemalis*): Ecological Implications. *The Auk*, 99(2), 299–308. Retrieved  
 506 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4085977>

507 van Berkel, M., Bateson, M., Nettle, D., & Dunn, J. (2018, March 7). Data and script for Van Berkel et  
 508 al: Can starlings use a reliable cue of future food deprivation to adaptively modify foraging and  
 509 fat reserves? <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1193788>

510 Witter, M. S., & Cuthill, I. C. (1993). The ecological costs of avian fat storage. *Philosophical*  
 511 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, 340(1291), 73–92.

512 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1993.0050>

513 Witter, M. S., Swaddle, J. P., & Cuthill, I. C. (1995). Periodic Food Availability and Strategic Regulation

514 of Body Mass in the European Starling, *Sturnus vulgaris*. *Functional Ecology*, 9(4), 568–574.

515 <http://doi.org/10.2307/2390146>

516

517

519 Table 1. Experimental design and schedule of measurements made

Day	Light cue	Deprivation		Measurements			
		Predictable	Unpredictable	Video C	Video N	Food intake	Dawn mass
1	X	X	X			X	
2						X	
3			X			X	X
4	X	X				X	
5			X			X	
6			X			X	X
7	X	X				X	
8	X	X	X			X	
9	X	X				X	X
10			X			X	
11	X	X				X	
12	X	X	X			X	X
13	X	X	X			X	
14			X			X	
15						X	X
16					X	X	
17	X	X		X		X	
18						X	X
19	X	X	X			X	
20	X	X	X			X	
21						X	X
22			X		X	X	
23	X	X	X			X	
24	X	X				X	X
25						X	
26	X	X		X		X	
27			X			X	X
28			X		X*	X	
29						X	
30	X	X				X	X
31					X*	X	
32	X	X	X	X		X	
33						X	X
34			X		X	X	
35						X	
36	X	X	X	X		X	X
37	X	X	X			X	
38			X			X	
39	X	X				X	X
40	X	X				X	
41						X	
42	X	NA	NA	X		X	X

520 Notes: crosses indicate: 1) days on which a light cue was given; 2) days on which five hours of food  
521 deprivation occurred; 3) cue days used in video analysis (Video C); 4) non-cue days used in video  
522 analysis (Video N); 5) days on which food intake 0950-1100 was measured; and 6) days on which  
523 dawn body mass was measured. \*days 28 and 31 were used in the video analysis for the Predictable  
524 and Unpredictable group respectively. The experiment ended at 1100 on day 42.

525

526

Table 2. Model parameter estimates for predictors of foraging time, food intake and dawn body mass.

Model	Response variable	Random effects	Fixed effects	Estimate	SE	LRT	p-value	CI 2.5%	CI 97.5%
1	Time spent foraging 1030-1100 (mins)	Natal nest / Bird	Day:CuePresent:TreatmentUnpredictable	0.05	1.05	0.002	0.96	-2.02	2.12
			Day:CuePresent	0.26	0.52	0.24	0.62	-0.78	1.29
			Day:TreatmentUnpredictable	-0.30	0.50	0.35	0.56	-1.29	0.70
			CuePresent:TreatmentUnpredictable	12.45	8.13	2.32	0.13	-3.60	28.51
			Day	0.01	0.25	0.003	0.96	-0.49	0.52
			<b>CuePresent</b>	<b>-17.34</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>16.60</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-25.47</b>	<b>-9.21</b>
			TreatmentUnpredictable	7.81	6.36	1.42	0.23	-5.60	21.02
			<b>Baseline foraging</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>46.31</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.39</b>
2	Food intake 0950-1100 (g)	Natal nest / Bird	Day:CuePresent:TreatmentUnpredictable	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.92	-0.02	0.02
			Day:CuePresent	0.03	0.004	0.43	0.51	-0.01	0.01
			Day:TreatmentUnpredictable	-0.01	0.004	3.55	0.06	-0.02	0.0003
			CuePresent:TreatmentUnpredictable	0.13	0.09	2.04	0.15	-0.05	0.30
			Day	-0.003	0.002	1.60	0.21	-0.01	0.001
			<b>CuePresent</b>	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>19.88</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.29</b>	<b>-0.11</b>
			TreatmentUnpredictable	0.14	0.29	0.24	0.62	-0.47	0.76
			<b>Baseline consumption</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>15.72</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.06</b>
3	Dawn body mass (g)	Natal nest / Bird	Day:TreatmentUnpredictable	0.01	0.01	1.15	0.28	-0.01	0.04
			<b>Day</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>49.34</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.06</b>
			TreatmentUnpredictable	0.10	1.65	0.004	0.95	-3.44	3.60
			Days since last deprivation	0.02	0.06	0.10	0.75	-0.09	0.13
			<b>Tarsus</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>5.78</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>4.71</b>
			<b>SexMale</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>6.96</b>

Fixed effects with p-values  $\leq 0.05$  are shown in bold.



532 FIGURE CAPTIONS

533 Figure 1. Schematic of light regime for cue and non-cue days with the deprivation period shown in  
534 grey shading. 1) Prior to dawn at 0950 food was removed and exchanged with a new bowl and video  
535 recording started. Any weighing occurred at this time. 2) At 1030, the light cue was given or not,  
536 depending on the day, and lasted for 30 minutes during which the birds were free to eat ad lib food.  
537 3) At 1100, food was either removed or exchanged with a new bowl, depending on whether the  
538 birds were deprived that day. Video recording was stopped at this time. 4) At 1600 a new bowl of  
539 food was given, regardless of events earlier in the day and birds were free to eat ad lib food until  
540 lights off at 0100 (not shown).

541 Figure 2. Mean time spent foraging in the 30 minutes after the time when a cue could be given  
542 (1030-1100). Data is shown over time for both a) the Predictable (n=8) and b) Unpredictable (n=8)  
543 treatment groups on days when a light cue was present or absent. Note that n = 4 on day 28 and  
544 n=4 on day 31 as one of each treatment groups had a deprivation event on the day preceding these  
545 two days, preventing us from including all birds in the analysis. The footage for Predictable and  
546 Unpredictable groups was analysed on day 28 and 31, respectively. Between-bird SE error bars are  
547 shown.

548 Figure 3. Mean food intake in the morning before deprivation could occur (0950-1100). Data are  
549 shown over time for both a) the Predictable (n=8) and b) Unpredictable (n=8) treatment groups on  
550 days when the light cue was present or absent. Between-bird SE bars are shown.

551 Figure 4. Mean body condition at dawn. Data are shown over time for the Predictable (n=8) and  
552 Unpredictable (n=8) treatment groups. Data before day 9 is omitted as it was deemed non-  
553 comparable between replicates (pre-dawn weighing did not start until day nine for the first replicate  
554 but was undertaken for the entirety of replicate two). Note: data are presented as body condition  
555 and not body mass to control for adult tarsus length, a measure of skeletal size. Between-bird SE  
556 error bars are shown.

557

558

559